DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 178 028 IR 007 458

AUTHOR Wellisch, Hans H.
TITLE The Arrangement of Entries in Non-Roman Scripts in Multiscript Catalogs and Bibliographies.
PUB DATE 78
NOTE 24p.
JOURNAL CIT International Forum on Information and Documentation; v3 n3 p18-24 1978

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Alphabets; *Bibliographic Citations; *Cataloging; Classification; Cyrillic Alphabet; *Filing; Library Standards; *Romanization

ABSTRACT

Citing the confusion generated for both librarians and users that results from the Romanization of bibliographic entries written in non-Roman scripts, it is argued that a standardized solution generally applicable to the arrangement of non-Roman script entries in bibliographic control tools should be found and adopted. Such entries should not be filed mechanically by name of script only because the resulting order would put entries for small collections in little-used scripts before those of more extensive collections in widely-used scripts, and would disperse entries in closely related scripts. A filing order for the 13 scripts that produce the present world output of books is proposed, based on the criteria of family affinity of scripts and the script's rank in the volume of world book production. Interfiling of entries in different languages or further subdivision by language, depending on the character of the script, is also suggested. A list of references is provided in addition to tables illustrating several aspects of the proposed solution. (FM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

INTERNATIONAL FORUM ON INFORMATION AND DOCUMENTATION
Vol. 3 No. 3 1978

THE ARRANGEMENT OF ENTRIES IN NON-ROMAN SCRIPTS IN MULTISCRIPT CATALOGS AND BIBLIOGRAPHIES

ED178028

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Hans H. Wellisch

College of Library and Information Services

University of Maryland

ABSTRACT

Entries in bibliographic control tools written in non-Roman scripts should not be filed mechanically by name of script only, because the resulting order would put entries for small collections in little-used scripts before those of more extensive collections in widely-used scripts, and would disperse entries in closely related scripts. A filing order for the 13 scripts that produce the present world output of books is proposed, based on the criteria of family affinity of scripts and volume of book production.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Hans H. Wellisch

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

IR007458

THE ARRANGEMENT OF ENTRIES WRITTEN IN NON-ROMAN SCRIPTS IN MULTISCRIPT CATALOGS AND BIBLIOGRAPHIES

Hans H. Wellisch

College of Library and Information Services

University of Maryland

The practice of Romanization of bibliographic entries written in non-Roman scripts that is almost universally followed in Western library catalogs and bibliographies has recently been challenged and criticized by several authors, including myself.[1-5] It has been pointed out that this method, ostensibly used in order to exercise and facilitate bibliographic control, generates mostly confusion and chaos for both librarians and users, particularly for those who are able to read documents in non-Roman scripts. Moreover, it has been shown that with present computer output devices it is possible to produce entries in practically all non-Roman scripts (including logographic ones) and to display them either under Romanized headings or in separate sequences by script. The most ambitious and comprehensive undertaking of this kind is the book catalog of the New York Public Library (NYPL) which now contains Hebrew and Yiddish entries in the original script, with entries in Cyrillic script to follow soon.[6] As the authors of this paper point out, a filing order for the various scripts will have to be decided upon when more than one non-Roman script will be included in the NYPL catalogs, because all main entries appear in Romanized form so as to collocate the works of authors. For example, translations of Shakespeare's King Lear will be filed first in languages

using the Roman script, alphabetized by the first word in the respective language, and followed by, say, Russian, Arabic, Hebrew, and Japanese translations--but in which order? (The example is mine, not Malinconico's.)

This question is raised not only by Malinconico et al. but also by Spalding, and the problem is bound to arise not only in the case of the NYPL but for any computer-produced book catalog of other libraries that will follow the example set by the NYPL, or for that matter in any catalog or bibliography that comprise more than one script. Where a separation of catalogs by script has already been made, as in the case of the Catalogue général des livres imprimés issued by the Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris (divided for books listed since 1960 into Roman, Cyrillic, Greek, and Hebrew parts) or the Singapore National Bibliography (which abandoned Romanization in 1975 in favor of separate sequences in several scripts) the problem has been solved by an ad hoc decision. It would seem to be in the interest of Universal Bibliographic Control to find a standardized solution generally applicable to the arrangement of non-Roman script entries in bibliographic control tools.

PRESENT FILING RULES

The ALA Filing Rules[7] which, according to their title, did not even envisage the possibilities and requirements of book catalogs much less those of computer-compatible filing of bibliographic entries, are of course predicated on complete Romanization of all headings and thus do not contain any rules pertaining to non-Roman scripts. The revised filing rules of the Library of Congress[8] likewise do not make any mention of non-Roman scripts. A comprehensive proposal for international filing rules[9] considers Greek letters as occasional components of an entry (e.g. γ-rays) but does not provide for whole words in non-Roman scripts. The new filing code of

the British Library[10] seems to be the first one to consider the arrangement of non-Roman scripts in its Rule 4.25 Non-Roman Alphabet Letters. However, it would appear from the example cited in ' that rule (mathematical formulae) that here too only occasional single non-Roman letters were considered. The filing order recommended by the BL code, namely by English name of script, though apparently

considered but not that of whole entries in a non-Roman script. The recommended filing order by the English name of a script, though apparently simple and in accordance with the general principle of the rules (namely not to permit separate filing sequences that are anything other than strictly alphabetical) would, as I shall show, not be useful for the arrangement of complete entries in non-Roman scripts.

THE PRINCIPAL SCRIPTS OF THE WORLD

Before being able to decide on any filing order of non-Roman scripts other than a purely mechanical one by the first letter of their names it is necessary to determine which scripts produce the present (and to a large extent also the past) output of books. In an earlier paper[11] I showed that about half a dozen scripts account for the bulk of contemporary book production. This fact has remained unchanged, although some of the data must now be revised due to the reentry of the People's Republic of China into the arena of book production. Based on the figures published by Unesco[12] and other sources for 1973 (the latest year for which an exact breakdown by language, and therefore implicitly by script, is available) the ranking of non-Roman scripts by book production is as shown in Table 1.

Thus, if the total present world book production is considered, we have to deal with no more than 12 (or at most 13) different scripts, some of which are definitely in a "minor" category as far as Western libraries are concerned, because these do not normally acquire materials in non-Roman scripts in quantities commensurate with the total output of such scripts. To take only the most obvious example of a discrepancy: while Japanese scholarly and research libraries make great efforts to acquire most of

Western literature, Japanese books are bought in any significant quantity only by a few specialized Western libraries, and even those will cover only a fraction of the Japanese annual output (at 35,500 titles the third largest in total world book production after Roman and Cyrillic).

ARRANGEMENT OF NON-ROMAN SCRIPTS BY THEIR NAMES

If the 13 scripts were arranged simply by their English names (a method not applicable internationally because the names of some scripts have different initial letters even in European languages) the filing sequence would be:

Amharic
Arabic
Armenian
Burmese
Chinese
Cyrillic
Georgian
Greek
Hebrew
Indian scripts
Japanese
Korean
Thai

Though not many libraries may have collections of books in all these scripts (or perhaps only very small ones in the lesser-known scripts) it is quite obvious that a purely mechanical arrangement would display small and little-used groups of entries in a prominent place right after the main Roman script sequence, while much larger and more heavily used ones would be relegated to

more distant places. It could of course be argued that this would not cause any great inconvenience to users of card catalogs who could simply skip all drawers containing entries in scripts that are of no interest to them and go directly to those drawers that contain the desired entries in, say, the Cyrillic script. But card catalogs are now more and more being abandoned by large libraries (those most likely to have books and other documents in non-Roman scripts), to be supplanted by book catalogs, microform catalogs, and on-line catalog displays. In book catalogs, separate sections for each script may be printed, their sequential order being governed by the classification system of a library which would distinguish the sectional volumes by language (the Dewey Decimal Classification, the UDC, and the Library of Congress Classification allow to make such distinctions). The most extensive set of such book catalogs by language and/or script is that of the British Museum Library which for more than a hundred years has published separate catalogs for books in non-Roman scripts (except for those in Cyrillic and Greek which are integrated into the main Roman sequence).[13]

But the real problem arises when multiscript entries have to be arranged under one main heading , as in the King Lear example above, or if, as in the NYPL catalog, all main entries are Romanized but the title and other bibliographic details are printed in a non-Roman script. A strictly mechanical arrangement would make for strange bedfellows such as Chinese and Cyrillic, or Hebrew and Japanese, while closely related scripts, e.g. Cyrillic and Greek, Chinese and Japanese, or Arabic and Hebrew which can often be read by the same group of users would be separated. If the principle of strict alphabetization by name of script would be extended to the individual Indian scripts, utter chaos would result because there are almost a dozen of them, their names ranging from Assamese to Tibetan, so that entries in any of the Indian scripts would be dispersed throughout the alphabetical sequence.

ARRANGEMENT BY BOOK PRODUCTION

In view of the fact that the relative rank of scripts in world book production seems to be rather stable and not likely to be subject to major fluctuations in the foreseeable future (though absolute production figures may vary due to various factors influencing the production of printed communication media in general) it might perhaps seem to be useful to group entries for books and other documents in non-Roman scripts by this criterion. However, as already pointed out above, the holdings of libraries or the entries listed in a bibliography will generally not reflect the pattern of present production due to the existence of large and long-established collections of, say, Judaica or East Asian material, or because a particular script and language is the specialty of a library, and so forth.

It is, however, interesting to note that the acquisition of books in non-Roman scripts by the Library of Congress shows a ranking that is somewhat similar to that of world book production. Table 2 shows figures for books in non-Roman scripts processed by the Library of Congress from July to December 1974, that is, during a period in which much of the total output in 1973 had probably reached the library, so that the processing figures can be related to some extent to those of total output.[14] The main exceptions in the LC acquisition pattern of books in non-Roman scripts as compared to world book production are the larger number of books in Hebrew (3 times higher than their percentage of total production), Indian scripts (more than double), and Arabic (almost double) which is understandable in the light of the library's large Semitic collections and its well-organized acquisition efforts through regional offices in the Middle East and in India. Otherwise, the ranking of the first six scripts which produce more than 90% of books in non-Roman scripts is remarkably similar to the overall ranking.

But few libraries, perhaps not even other large national libraries, will show a pattern of acquisitions similar to that of LC, and arrangement of non-Roman scripts by book production alone would not necessarily result in a helpful arrangement, especially since the arbitrary dispersal of related scripts would obtain also if this method were chosen. As we shall see, book production rankings can only play a secondary role in arrangement.

ARRANGEMENT BY GRAPHEMIC TYPE OF SCRIPT

The scripts with which we have to deal can, for practical purposes, be divided into two large groups by graphemic type, namely alphabetic scripts in which each character stands (ideally) for one phoneme, and logographic scripts in which each character stands for a concept and is independent of the phonology of words used to express that concept. (The only truly syllabic script presently in use, the Japanese kana, can be disregarded in this context because most Japanese texts are written in kanji, the Chinese logograms, which are the principal elements of the script, augmented and supported by kana that play a supporting role.) If the graphemic principle of arrangement were used, subarrangement could again be either alphabetical or by book production, resulting in the sequences shown in Table 3. Although either of these arrangements would bring together all logographic scripts (which is highly desirable and is indeed a principle of arrangement applied in many Asian libraries and particularly in Japanese library catalogs), they would still disperse all alphabetic scripts in a most unhelpful manner, and would thus not constitute an improvement on the methods previously considered.

ARRANGEMENT BY FAMILIES OF SCRIPTS

Taking the graphemic typology of scripts one step further, they can be grouped by "family", a somewhat loose and perhaps not quite scientific term for what

is a mixture of geographic and historic affinity. Grouping by family is, however, a principle that gives more acceptable and practical results than any other method. The four families into which the 13 scripts can conveniently be grouped are shown in Table 4.

Subdivision of each family alphabetically by name of script would result in undue emphasis on entries in little-used scripts which even in large libraries would not deserve places of prominence. But subarrangement by rank in world book production results in an order that would put the most numerous non-Roman script collections of Western libraries in a place where they would serve the majority of users while at the same time keeping closely related scripts together.

SUBARRANGEMENT BY LANGUAGE

Several of the scripts considered here serve in the writing systems of more than one language. Cyrillic is used to write Russian, Ukrainian, White-Russian, Bulgarian, Serbian, and Macedonian, as well as more than 60 non-Slavic languages of the USSR and Mongolian; Arabic is the script of Arabic, Persian, Pushto, Urdu, Sindhi, Ottoman Turkish, and some other languages; Hebrew is used to write Hebrew, Yiddish, and Ladino; and a large number of Chinese characters is common to Chinese, Japanese, and Korean.

This raises the question whether entries in different languages but written in the same script should be interfiled within that script, as is the custom for Roman script entries. For these, diacritical marks are ignored in filing (at least in Anglo-American and French practice), all modified letters being filed as if they were basic letters, and divergent alphabetical order (e.g. in Spanish or in the Scandinavian languages) is disregarded in favor of

the standard English alphabet. This results in a mixture of entries for all languages written in Roman script, although it is not at all certain whether this arrangement is the optimal one for the majority of users or whether it is perhaps only the most convenient way of arrangement serving the needs of librarians and bibliographers. So far as is known, the issue has never been tested in user surveys and might well be worth investigating. Our immediate concern is, however, with the question whether entries in Cyrillic, Arabic, and so on can be handled in the same manner. It seems that no uniform rule can be established, and that each script has to be considered on its own merits.

Cyrillic. A distinction must first be made between the Slavic and non-Slavic languages written in this script. Entries in the Slavic languages can indeed be interfiled, although each of the 6 alphabets contains letters missing in some or all of the 5 others, and vice versa. For effective interfiling, a uniform and comprehensive filing sequence is necessary. Such a sequence for all 52 Slavic Cyrillic letters (including obsolete ones used in Russian before 1918 and in Bulgarian before 1945) is contained in the international standard ISO/9 Transliteration of Slavic Cyrillic Alphabets. If entries are interfiled according to this sequence, cross references from variant spellings of the same name or word in different languages, e.g. Serbian Југославија vs. Russian Югославия must, of course, be made.

The Cyrillic alphabets devised for more than 60 non-Slavic languages of the USSR and for Mongolian contain a large number of Cyrillic letters modified by various diacritical marks as well as non-Cyrillic letters specially designed to express phonemes of certain languages. Altogether, there

are more than a hundred different letters in these alphabets (including the Russian Cyrillic ones) and the languages belong to quite different linguistic families. A uniform filing sequence for all Cyrillic letters, including all modified and special ones, has been established in the international standard ISO/2805 Transliteration of Alphabets of Non-Slavic Languages of the Soviet Union Using Cyrillic Characters, but in the Soviet Union these alphabets are filed separately by language. It is advisable to follow this practice also in those Western libraries that acquire the not very voluminous literature of these languages, arranging entries first by linguistic family and volume of book production: Turkic, Caucasian, Iranian, and others; individual entries to be interfiled in each group according to ISO/2805. Incidentally, when authors' names or titles written in one of the extended Cyrillic alphabets is cited in Russian literature, they are mostly rendered by basic Cyrillic letters, a practice similar to the one by which French loanwords such as café, détente, façade, rôle, or the German word Fräulein are often printed in English texts without the diacritical marks.

Arabic. The modifications of the classical Arabic alphabet to express phonemes specific to non-Semitic languages are restricted to diacritical marks of various kinds, but no new letters have been added to the basic repertory of 28 letters. This makes it possible to interfile at least names of authors, the more so since a large number of them have Muslim names spelled identically irrespective of the pronunciation in a particular language.[15] (This is comparable to the name Charles, written identically in English and French orthography, but pronounced differently.) As to titles, these are probably best kept apart by language, though technically they can be interfiled in the same way as titles in various Western languages written in Roman script. If filed by language, the sequence ought to be: Arabic, Persian, Pushto, Urdu, Sindi, Ottoman Turkish, others.

Hebrew. Interfiling of Hebrew and Yiddish names and titles is possible, but here too care must be taken to provide cross references from the spelling of an author's name in Hebrew and in Yiddish which might be substantially different (many Jewish authors write both original Hebrew and Yiddish works, and there are numerous translations from one language into the other). Large Judaica collections have found it more convenient, however, to maintain separate files for the two languages, with appropriate cross references. Entries in Ladino and other languages formerly written in Hebrew script can be interfiled with Hebrew entries.

Indian scripts. This term is used here to cover Devanagari (the ancient script of Sanskrit and the Prakrits, still employed today to write Hindi and Marathi) and 10 other scripts derived from or closely related to it. Of the 15 officially recognized languages of India, Kashmiri Sindhi and Urdu (the latter also the official language of Pakistan) are written in Arabic. Entries in any of these languages will thus have to be filed in the Arabic script sequence, possibly with occasional cross references to names of authors in one of the Indian scripts. The 12 other Indian languages are written in Devanagari and in 8 other scripts. Sinhalese, spoken in Sri Lanka (Ceylon), and Tibetan are also written in scripts derived from Devanagari.

As already pointed out, a purely alphabetical arrangement would not make sense in a general sequence of scripts, but it would also be unhelpful if applied to the individual members of the Indian script group. The 11 Indian scripts are used by two large and linguistically unrelated families of languages, namely the Indo-Aryan one, comprising (in alphabetical order) Assamese, Bengali, Hindi, Gujarati, Marathi, Oriya, Punjabi (written in a

script called Gurmukhi), Sanskrit, and Sinhalese; and the Dravidian family, to which belong Kannada, Malayalam, Tamil, and Telugu. Of these languages, Hindi, Marathi, and Sanskrit are all written in Devanagari, and Assamese and Bengali also have a common alphabet. All other languages have their own alphabets.

The practice of Indian libraries, as documented in a textbook[16] and in a report[17] favors separate entries by language and script, but I could not find an indication of rules for the sequential arrangement of such separate files. In his many books on cataloging, S.R. Ranganathan has nothing to say about filing and he addresses the problem only obliquely in one of his last works:

> "We also need the help in regard to the difficulties in alphabetical arrangement, caused by the inflectional and coalescence quality of the Indian languages."[18]

(I do not know what Ranganathan meant by "coalescence quality" but that is immaterial to our topic.) C.G. Viswanathan, the author of another Indian textbook on cataloging, does not mention the problem of filing either. Since I cannot claim to be an expert on Indian languages and scripts, the following suggestions are therefore offered only tentatively, subject to comments by Indian librarians who are in a better position to judge their usefulness.

It would seem advisable first of all to separate entries in Indo-Aryan and Dravidian languages, because the scripts of each group show close affinities, and two or more languages in either group are often mutually understood by readers familiar with one of them. In the Indo-Aryan group entries in Devanagari script (i.e. written in Hindi, Marathi, or Sanskrit) should be filed first because of the historical importance of Sanskrit and

the present importance of Hindi, the language designated by the Indian government as the principal official language of the Union. (In 1973, books printed in Devanagari accounted for more than a third of the total Indian book production in non-Roman scripts.) This group should be followed by entries in Assamese and Bengali (interfiled), producing the next highest combined output of books. The rest may be arranged by name of script, an order that happens to coincide almost exactly with the respective book production. In the Dravidian group of scripts, arrangement by book production would yield the order Tamil, Kannada, Malayalam, Telugu. Tibetan should be filed last, since it belongs to an entirely different language family, and also because at present no books or perhaps only a very few seem to be published, due to the political events in Tibet.

Chinese characters. Many Chinese characters have the same or very similar meaning in Chinese, Japanese, and Korean, and they can be understood by readers of the respective languages (though they will be pronounced quite differently). However, since Japanese texts make also use of the kana syllabaries, and Korean texts written in Chinese characters are supplemented by the indigenous Han'gŭl alphabet, the three languages must be kept in separate files. Even if entries in Chinese characters are Romanized and then arranged as are other words written in Roman scripts (a practice now increasingly employed in Japan and also to some extent in the People's Republic of China) it is not advisable to mix entries in the three languages. Names of authors or titles of works must always be displayed also in Chinese characters because Romanizations are highly ambiguous.

It should be noted in passing that both the kana syllabaries and the Han'gŭl alphabet (which is a true alphabet, not a logographic script) have traditional standardized filing orders.

CONCLUSION

The subarrangement of bibliographic items in large library catalogs or in comprehensive bibliographies displaying more than two different scripts should be governed, in descending order, by the following principles:

(a) Affinity of a script to one of four large families of scripts;

(b) Rank of script in world book production;

(c) Interfiling of entries in different languages or further subdivision by language, depending on the character of the script.

Needless to say, catalogs of smaller libraries or bibliographies containing entries in only two scripts, say, Roman and Cyrillic, may arrange the entries simply according to their quantity. The same principles apply to back-of-the-book indexes in more than one script, where two scripts do not pose any problems, while several different ones may best be arranged in the order given above for catalogs.

Such rules admittedly run counter to the principle of strict alphabetical arrangement of bibliographic entries, and it would seem as if they would attempt to introduce again the dreaded feature of classified sub-arrangement which is so detrimental to the correct filing of entries (whether by human beings or computer) and to their retrieval from large files, unless the user knows the principle behind a classified or otherwise not strictly alphabetical arrangement (which is mostly not the case). However, as I have shown, strict alphabetical filing of non-Roman scripts by their name would not result in a helpful arrangement of entries. The suggested order (which would in most cases range over no more than half a dozen scripts) would be easy to display for the purpose of users' guidance, and would result in what is probably the most helpful order of entries. Table 5 summarizes the proposed filing order of scripts and their sub-arrangement.

If additional justification for a deviation from the strict principle of alphabetic arrangement is needed, it might be taken from an entirely different field, namely chemistry. The formula index of Chemical Abstracts is arranged by the Hill system, according to which all chemical elements in a compound are arranged strictly alphabetically, except if carbon or both carbon and hydrogen are present, in which case the letters C, or C followed by H precede all other letters of the alphabet. The system is thus based on a principle of most common occurrence and importance, combined with a mechanical one of alphabetization, and it has worked well for chemists for over seventy years. There is no reason why the proposed arrangement of bibliographic entries in non-Roman scripts should not work equally well in bibliographic control tools and in indexes.

REFERENCES

1. WEINBERG, B. Transliteration in documentation. J. Doc. 30, 1974, 18-31.

2. SPALDING, C.S. Romanization re-examined. Libr. Resources Tech. Serv. 21, 1977, 3-12.

3. WELLISCH, H.H. Romanization as a noise factor in bibliographic control. In Information interaction. American Society for Information Science 5th Mid-year Meeting, Nashville, Tenn., 1976. Washington, D.C.: ASIS, 1976, pp. 101-108.

4. WELLISCH, H.H. Conversion of scripts and Universal Bibliographic Control. Proceedings of
In IFLA Worldwide Seminar, Seoul, 1976. Seoul: Korean Library Assn., 1976, pp. 377-392.

5. WELLISCH, H.H. Script conversion and bibliographic control of documents in dissimilar scripts: problems and alternatives. Int. Lib. Rev. 10, 1978,

6. MALINCONICO, S.M., et al. Vernacular scripts in the NYPL automated bibliographic control system. J. Libr. Autom. 10, 1977, 205-225.

7. American Library Association. ALA rules for filing catalog cards. 2nd ed. Chicago: ALA, 1968.

8. RATHER, J.C. Filing arrangement in the Library of Congress catalogs. Lib. Resources Tech, Serv. 16, 1972, 240-261.

9. WÜSTER, E. International filing rules. International Forum on Information and Documentation 2 (1977):18-29.

10) PHILLIPS, C.M. British Library filing rules. Intern. Cataloguing 3, 1974, 6-8.

11. WELLISCH, H.H. The relative importance of the world's major scripts. Libri 25, 1975, 238-250.

12. UNESCO. Unesco statistical yearbook 1974. Paris: Unesco, 1975.

13. FRANCIS, F.C. The catalogues of the British Museum. 3. Oriental printed books and manuscripts. J. Doc. 7, 1951, 170-183.

14. The figures were kindly provided by the staff of the Library of Congress' Descriptive and Shared Cataloging Divisions.

15. This pertains, of course, only to classical Muslim names such as Muḥammad, ʿAlī, Fāṭima. Many Muslim names are spelled differently and the formation of personal names also differs widely in non-Arabic languages. See M.A. Ashoor, "The formation of Muslim names", International Library Review 9 (1977):491-500.

16. MITTAL, R.L. and S. GUPTA. Dictionary catalogue: a practical manual. Delhi: Metropolitan Book co., 1966.

17. MEHTA, J.C. Problems of the multi-language, multi-script library: cataloguing in Delhi Public Library. Intern. Cataloguing 2, 1973, 5-6.

18. RANGANATHAN, S.R. Cataloguing practice, 2nd ed. London: Asia Publishing House, 1974, p. 504.

TABLE 2

BOOKS IN NON-ROMAN SCRIPTS PROCESSED BY THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS,

JULY - DECEMBER 1974

Script	Books in non-Roman scripts			
	Processed by LC		World production	
	Rank	Percentage	Rank	Percentage
Cyrillic	1	37.2	1	50.0
Japanese	2	27.0	2	21.9
Indian scripts	3	10.6	4	5.4
Arabic	4	8.0	5	4.6
Chinese	5	7.3	3	7.0
Hebrew	6	3.5	9	1.2
Korean	7	2.3	6	4.6
Greek	8	1.7	7	1.4
Armenian	9	1.2	12	0.5
Thai	10	0.7	8	1.4
Burmese	11	0.5	11	0.9
Georgian	-	-	10	1.0
Amharic	-	-	13	0.1

TABLE 3

ARRANGEMENT OF NON-ROMAN SCRIPTS BY GRAPHEMIC TYPE

Graphemic type	Arranged alphabetically by name of script	Arranged by book production
Alphabetic	Amharic	Cyrillic
	Arabic	Indian scripts
	Armenian	Arabic
	Burmese	Greek
	Cyrillic	Thai
	Georgian	Hebrew
	Greek	Georgian
	Hebrew	Burmese
	Indian scripts	Armenian
	Thai	Amharic
Logographic	Chinese	Japanese
	Japanese	Chinese
	Korean	Korean

TABLE 4

ARRANGEMENT OF SCRIPTS BY FAMILY

Family	Arranged alphabetically by name of scripts	Arranged by book production
European	Armenian	Cyrillic
	Cyrillic	Greek
	Georgian	Georgian
	Greek	Armenian
Semitic	Amharic	Arabic
	Arabic	Hebrew
	Hebrew	Amharic
South Asian	Burmese	Indian scripts
	Indian scripts	Thai
	Thai	Burmese
East Asian	Chinese	Japanese
	Japanese	Chinese
	Korean	Korean

TABLE 5

RECOMMENDED ARRANGEMENT OF ENTRIES IN MULTISCRIPT BIBLIOGRAPHIC TOOLS

Script	Arrangement of entries	
	1st level	2nd level
Roman	Alphabetically interfiled	-
Cyrillic		
Slavic languages	Alphabetically interfiled	-
Non-Slavic languages	Turkic, Caucasian, Iranian, Others	Alphabetically interfiled in each group
Greek	Alphabetical	
Georgian	Alphabetical	-
Armenian	Alphabetical	-
Arabic	Alphabetically interfiled	-
Hebrew		
Hebrew	Alphabetically	-
Yiddish	Alphabetically	-
Amharic	Alphabetically	-
Indian scripts	Devanagari (Hindi, Marathi and Sanskrit	Alphabetically interfiled
	Assamese, Bengali	Alphabetically interfiled
	Gujarati	Alphabetical
	Oriya	"
	Punjabi (Gurmukhi)	"
	Sinhalese	"
	Tamil	"
	Kannada	"
	Malayalam	"
	Telugu	"
	Tibetan	"

TABLE 5 (continued)

Thai	Alphabetical	–
Burmese	Alphabetical	–
Japanese	By Romanization	Alphabetical
Chinese	" "	"
Korean	" "	"

NOTES.

(a) In catalogs, bibliographies, or indexes in which entries in any of the scripts are significantly more numerous than all others, these entries are to be listed first.

(b) Ancient and obsolete scripts in which at present few or no books or other documents are published (e.g. Glagolitic, Syriac) have been excluded from the table. If needed, entries in such scripts are to be arranged after those that are closely related to them, e.g. Glagolitic after Cyrillic, Syriac after Arabic.